

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7 were pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 2, 6, and 8-9 were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, and 7 were rejected.

Claims 1, 5, and 7 are hereby amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection of Claims

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office asserts that the claims should be amended to include the disclosed non-transitory computer readable media, while at the same time excluding the intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, and etc. See final Office Action at page 3.

The requested change has been made. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cariffe (US 6,281,872) in view of Barrett (US 5,301,036).

Independent claim 1 recites a print terminal comprising an image-processing unit configured to “(iii) simultaneously rotate both the print image and the print-medium image in a common direction by a common rotation angle.” Independent claims 5 and 7 recite similar features.

In setting forth the rejection, the Office acknowledges that Cariffe does not disclose this subject matter. See final Office Action at page 4. The Office thus relies upon Barrett for this subject matter. In particular, the Office asserts that Barrett discloses this subject matter at Fig. 11 and at column 8, lines 36-50. See final Office Action at page 5.

Even assuming that one of ordinary skill in the art would combine Cariffe with Barrett, Applicant submits that Barrett fails to cure the deficiencies of Cariffe. Instead, at column 8, lines 36-50, Barrett merely discloses that if a duplex input print icon 194 and duplex output print icon 198 are selected, then a duplex output print orientation icon 216 is produced. Barrett further

discloses image orientation with respect to duplex printing. That is, in Barrett, a print method is selected (duplex printing) and then an image orientation may be selected. Barrett, however, does not disclose an image-processing unit configured to simultaneously rotate both the print image and the print-medium image in a common direction by a common rotation angle (emphasis added), as required by the claims.

In addition, Barrett also fails to disclose these features at Fig. 11. Instead, Barrett discloses a likely set of potential orientations. In this regard, Barrett discloses that column 2 illustrates how those copy sheets travel through a reproduction device such as Xerox Docutech Publishing System. See Barrett at column 10, lines 12-16. That is, Fig. 11 illustrates the necessary rotations that need to be made to “A” and “B” such that “A” and “B” are printed correctly in the selected format. Barrett, however, does not disclose an image-processing unit configured to simultaneously rotate both the print image and the print-medium image in a common direction by a common rotation angle (emphasis added), as required by the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of the claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

If the Examiner finds that there are any outstanding issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
SNR DENTON US LLP

By: /David R. Metzger/

David Metzger, Reg. No. 32,919
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
415-882-5064 (telephone)
415-882-0300 (facsimile)
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT